IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GOPALAKRISHNA TAMADA

Writ Petition No.21009 of 1998

Dated: 10-04-2007

Between:

Suraj Printers & Packagers,
a partnership firm, rep. by its Managing Parnter
Sri R. Srirama Raju, 37, Reddy Shopping Complex,
Tilak Road, Abids, Hyderabad.

... Petitioner

and

The Commissioner,
Information & Public Relations Department,
Government of Andhra Pradesh,
AC Guards, Hyderabad.

... Respondent

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a *mandamus* to declare the order in letter No.016644/Pub/C1/98, dated 22-07-1998 of respondent, as arbitrary and illegal and consequently direct respondent not to give effect to the same.

2. Facts, in brief, are: Petitioner is a Printers & Packagers and it has executed printing works during the last 12 years worth of Rs.3 crores without any complaint whatsoever. An order was placed on petitioner on

12-12-1997 for printing one lakh copies of booklets with title in multi colour and text matter in single colour titled as “Prajale Sarathuluga Pragathi Padamulo – Andhra Pradesh” with instructions to deliver the printed matter by 15-12-1997 or latest by 16-12-1997. The value of the work was Rs.9,49,620/-. Petitioner completed the job work within the time specified and delivered the books to the representatives of respondent. It is stated that while so, the Hon’ble Minister for Information and Public Relations seems to have noticed certain deficiencies in the booklets printed and supplied, called for a report from respondent. Later based on the report of respondent, an amount of approximately Rs.80,000/- was deducted from the bills payable to petitioner and the matter was treated as closed by all the concerned. Subsequently, respondent placed further orders on petitioner worth Rs.4 to 5 lakhs and petitioner successfully executed the same during March-April, 1998. To the utter shock and surprise of petitioner, respondent issued the impugned letter, without issuing any show-cause notice and without conducting any enquiry.

3. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

4. The only issue raised by learned Counsel for petitioner during the course of hearing is that the order, dated 22-07-1998 passed by respondent, by which petitioner is blacklisted, is without notice, which is not denied by respondent.

5. In the light of the same, this Court is of the view that the said action of respondent in blacklisting the petitioner is definitely violative

of principles of natural justice and accordingly, the same is liable to be set aside.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 22-07-1998 is set aside. However, the authorities may, if they so choose issue notice to petitioner calling for explanation and thereafter may pass appropriate orders. No costs.

_____

JUSTICE GOPALAKRISHNA TAMADA

Dt.10-04-2007
GLV